UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,154	02/13/2004	Krishna V. Kotipalli	306213.01	5107

22971 7590 11/27/2009

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER	
HE, JIALONG	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/27/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com
ntovar@microsoft.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/777,154	KOTIPALLI, KRISHNA V.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JIALONG HE	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 November 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *6,8-10,16,18-20 and 25-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *6,8-10,16,18-20 and 25-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Response to Arguments

2. In the response filed on 11/11/2009, the applicant pointed out (Remarks, page 7) in the previous office action mailed on 9/11/2009, two new claims (claims 30 and 31), which were added in the response to non-final rejection mailed on 4/29/2009, were not examined. The Examiner apologizes for overlooking these two newly added claims in the previous action. The finality of the previous Office action is withdrawn and these two claims are addressed in this office action.

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/11/2009 regarding independent claims 6 and 16 (Remarks, 7-10) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons.

4. The claims and only the claims form the metes and bounds of the invention. "Office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ

541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969)" (MPEP p 2100-8, c 2, l 45-48; p 2100-9, c 1, l 1-4). The Examiner has full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense. The Examiner will reference prior art using terminology familiar to one of ordinary skill in the art. Such an approach is broad in concept and can be either explicit or implicit in meaning.

Regarding claims 6 and 16, the applicant argues Janakiraman (US Pat. 7,369,986) does not teach "**on an input** of a computing device" (emphasis in original Remarks), rather Janakiraman merely discloses "hover over" or "click on" on preexisting document for translation and is not "received ... on an input of the computing device (e.g., on a keyboard) as provided in independent claims 6 and 16"

In response, the Examiner notes that Janakiraman shows a computer input device includes both keyboard and mouse (**fig. 3, #320**). The specification does not redefine the term "input", therefore, the term "input" is given its ordinary and customary meaning. A user selects and clicks a text string displayed on a computer screen with a mouse device on a computer reads on the limitation "receiving a text string ... on an input of a computing device".

The applicant further argues (Remarks, page 9) "*it is unclear from Janakiraman whether the second script is derived based upon a* ***phonetic mapping scheme*** *as provided in claims 6 and 16. That is, it is unclear whether the English characters that*

are derived from the Indian text string, for example, are output from the transliteration mechanism because they are phonetically similar to the characters in the Indian text string" (emphasis in original Remarks).

In response, the Examiner points out Janakiraman discloses transliterating displayed webpage between different Indian languages and also using English alphabets to represent pronunciation of Indian words (**Fig. 4A-4E, col. 3, lines 1-6, sounds are similar; col. 7, 7, lines 1-3, user may be able to sound out words in the English language script and recognize the Tamil text in the table**). It is clear Janakiraman's transliteration mapping is based on phonetic (sound similar) mapping scheme.

The applicant further argues (Remarks, page 10) that "*Janakiraman does not disclose transliteration **through an intermediary language,"** (page 5) which is provided for in independent claims 6 and 16. The Final Office Actions alleges that Bruso discloses converting a phonetic string into a third alphabet based on a second predefined phonetic mapping scheme, but does not allege that Bruso teaches what Janakiraman admittedly lacks, namely converting a text string to a phonetic string in a second alphabet of an intermediary language.*" (emphasis in original Remarks).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections

are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The Examiner notes Janakiraman discloses transliteration of between two languages (Janakiraman, Fig. 4A-4E, two character sets, for example, Tamil symbols and English alphabets) but does not disclose through an intermediary language (intermediary character set). Bruso discloses transliteration of two coded character sets through an intermediary character set. The combined teaching of Janakiraman and Bruso teaches the limitation "converting the text string to a phonetic string in a second alphabet of an intermediary language, based on a first predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the first alphabet and the second alphabet;"

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 30-31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 30, which was newly added in the response filed on 7/27/2009, recited limitations "receiving **a non-phonetic text string** ..."; "converting **the non-phonetic text** string...". The applicant does not point out where in the original disclosure supports this new limitation. By carefully looking at the original disclosure, the most relevant section is in the background (specification, page 1) which states "languages such as Chinese, Japanese, Russian, Arabic, Korean, Hindi, Sanskrit and various other languages that utilize **non-Latin alphabets**". However, the "non-Latin alphabets" in the disclosure does not provide adequate support for the limitation "a non-phonetic text string".

Claim 31 depends on claim 30 and includes all limitations of claim 30. Therefore, claim 31 is rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claim 6, 8-10, 16, 18-20 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al (US Pat. 7,369,986. hereinafter referred to as Janakiraman) in view of Bruso et al. (US Pat. 5,649,214, hereinafter referred to as Bruso).

Regarding claims 6 and 16, Janakiraman discloses a computer implemented method and computer readable medium (**col. 8, computer readable medium embodiment**) for transliterating languages in a computing device comprising:

receiving a text string in a first alphabet of a first language on an input of the computing device (**col. 7, col. 7, lines 10-25, Fig. 4A-4E, receiving typed messages from a keyboard, fig. 5A, Tamil version, fig. 5C, English version**);

converting the text string to a phonetic string in a second alphabet, based on a first predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the first alphabet and the second alphabet (**col. 6, lines 7-20, fig. 4A –fig 4E, transliteration Tamil language Governor to "aaLuunjar"**);

transliterating the text, wherein the text string in the first alphabet is different than the phonetic string (**fig. 6, #610, fig. 7, transliteration between Tamil and English**).

Janakiraman discloses using English characters to represent various languages used in India by transliteration (**title and Abstract**). Janakiraman does not disclose transliteration through an intermediary language.

Bruso discloses converting the phonetic string into a third alphabet of a second language, based on a second predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the second alphabet and the third alphabet (**Bruso, col. 2, col. 2, lines 43-67, mapping**

the intermediated coded character set to ISO 8859 character set (a third alphabet of a second language)**, also fig. 3A and 3B**).

Janakiraman and Bruso are analogous art and from a similar field of applicant's endeavor in transliteration. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Janakiraman's teaching with Bruso's teaching to transliterate a language to another language through an through an intermediary language. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a modification because the documents are still available during transliteration procedure (**Bruso, col. 2, lines 33-46**).

Regarding claims 8 and 18, Janakiraman further discloses the first language is a western language and the second language is an Indic language (**Fig. 4C, English, Fig. 5A, Tamil, also fig. 4A**).

Regarding claims 9 and 19, Janakiraman further discloses the first language is an Indic language and the second language is another Indic language (**col. 1, lines 45-55, transliterating a selected word to a target language, col. 1, lines 14-20, target languages could be Hindi, Sanskrit, Urdu and all 18 India official languages**).

Regarding claims 10 and 20, Janakiraman further discloses displaying the converted text string on an output device (**fig. 4A- fig. 4E**).

Regarding claims 25 and 26, Janakiraman further discloses transmitting the converted phonetic string to a remote processing device (**fig. 1, network, fig. 2, server, fig. 4A-4B, web browser**).

Regarding claims 27, Janakiraman further discloses the text string in the first alphabet is different than the phonetic string in the second alphabet (**col. 6, lines 10-20, fig. 4A, Tamil writing and English language script for word "Governor" is different**).

Regarding claims 28, Janakiraman further discloses the phonetic string contains at least one character from the second alphabet which is not present in the first alphabet **col. 6, lines 10-20, fig. 4A, Tamil writing and English language using different characters**).

Regarding claims 29, the combined teaching of Janakiraman and Bruso further discloses the converted phonetic string contains at least one character from the third alphabet which is not present in the second alphabet (**Janakiraman, col. 1, lines 12-40, different Indian languages and English use different characters; Bruso, fig. 3, German language use Umlaut characters**).

8. Claims 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman in view of Tolin (US Pat. 5,490,061, previously cited, hereinafter referred to as Tolin).

Regarding claim 30, Janakiraman discloses a computer readable storage medium (**fig. 3, #326**) having computer executable instructions stored thereon that, when executed, cause a computing device to perform a method for transliterating languages, the method comprising:

receiving a non-phonetic text string in a first alphabet of a first language on an input of the computing device (**fig. 4A-4C, webpage displayed in Tamil language, (first alphabet of a first langauge)**);

converting a first alphabet of a first language into a second alphabet of a second language, based on a predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the first alphabet and the second alphabet (**Fig, 4A-4E, and fig. 5A-5B, mapping Tamil characters to English alphabets**);

wherein the first language and the second language are each different languages (**Fig, 4A-4E, Tamil and English languages**), and

wherein the non-phonetic text string and the second phonetic string are each different strings (**Fig, 4A-4E, Tamil and English text and phonetic strings**).

Janakiraman discloses mapping phonetic strings (translation) between different Indian languages (e.g., Hindi, Urdu, Tamil,) and English. Janakiraman does not disclose translation two languages through an intermediary language.

Tolin discloses translating many languages through an intermediary language (**Tolin, fig. 1 and 3, English -> Esperanto -> Chinese**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Janakiraman's teaching with Tolin's teaching to translate an India language through an intermediary language Esperanto into English. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a modification because it solves a problem of lacking direct translation solutions from a source language to a target language (**Tolin, col. 32-40**).

Regarding claim 31, the combined teaching of Janakiraman and Tolin further discloses a direct phonetic mapping scheme from the first language to the second language is unavailable (**Tolin, col. 32-40, lack of direct translation from one language to another language**).

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JIALONG HE whose telephone number is (571) 270-

5359. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00AM-4:30PM, ALT. Fridays, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JH/

/Richemond Dorvil/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626